

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-14 and 16-20 were rejected.

Claim 15 was objected to.

Claims 1, 9, and 16 have been amended herein.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication of allowable subject matter.

An amendment to the specification is made to correct an informality.

**I. OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS**

The claims have been amended to specify the secondary side of the transformer, rather than the windings in particular. As this is shown in the drawings as filed, no changes to the drawing are believed to be necessary, and so this objection is believed to be obviated.

**II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-15 and 16-20 were rejected as anticipated by Sultenfus.

Independent claim 1 as amended requires, among other limitations, “a network transmission medium interface directly connected to a secondary side of the transformer; and a first portion of a docking connector also directly connected to the secondary side”. This limitation is not taught or suggested by the art of record.

The Examiner believes that the claimed transformer is met by Sultenfuss's elements 178 and 180, incorrectly characterizing this as "a transformer connected to the physical layer chip (primary coil 178 and secondary coil 180, Fig. 3, both having a common core,...". This characterization is unsupported in Sultenfuss.

At no time does Sultenfuss teach or suggest that elements 178 and 180 act as a primary or secondary coil, or that they have a common core, and it is unclear why the Examiner would imply that it does. With regard to Figure 3, Sultenfuss describes "Selection of inductive device 178 and/or 180, or an alternative device or device combination designed to compensate or tune one or more electrical characteristics of a selected communication pathway, may be directed towards cancellation, compensation or tuning of one or more electrical characteristics of a given communication pathway. For example, selection of inductive device 178 and/or 180 may primarily concern compensating or tuning the switch capacitance 196 and/or 197 resulting from the incorporation of communication switch 94" (paragraph 0049). Sultenfuss also teaches "In one embodiment, the process described above for selection of inductive device 178 and/or 180 may be repeated for each transmission line or transmission line pair desired to be tuned or compensated" (paragraph 0050), and "instead of placing inductive device 178 and 180 on transmission lines 104 and 106, respectively, an inductive device may be placed on each of transmission line pairs 120 and 122" (paragraph 0051).

As is clear, Sultenfuss describes "inductive devices" 178 and 180, but at no point describes that they have a common core, that they form a transformer, or that they interact at all. As such,

neither of elements 178 or 180 can perform as a secondary side of a transformer, as claimed (nor, of course, as a secondary winding of a transformer).

Further, independent claim 1 requires “a network transmission medium interface directly connected to a secondary side of the transformer; and a first portion of a docking connector also directly connected to the secondary side” (emphasis added). This language clearly shows that the network transmission medium interface and the first portion of a docking connector are both directly connected to the secondary side, at the same time. As clearly shown in Sultenfuss’s Figure 3, switches 202 and 203 ensure that either communication port 96 or port replicator connector 100 is connected at any time to inductive devices 178 or 180, never both of them.

As such, independent claim 1 clearly distinguishes over Sultenfuss, as multiple limitations are not taught or suggested by Sultenfuss. As independent claims 9 and 16 include similar limitations to those discussed above, and were rejected in common with claim 1 without further discussion by the Examiner, these claims also distinguish over Sultenfuss, as at least one limitation of each of these claims is not taught or suggested by Sultenfuss. All independent claims are allowable, and therefore all dependent claims are similarly allowable.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

All rejections are traversed.

### III. CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully asserts that all pending claims in this application are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests full allowance of the claims.

### SUMMARY


If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *wmunck@davismunck.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees connected with this communication (including any extension of time fee) or credit any overpayment to Davis Munck Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: Feb 13, 2006

  
William A. Munck  
Registration No. 39,308

P.O. Drawer 800889  
Dallas, Texas 75380  
Tel.: (972) 628-3600  
Fax: (972) 628-3616  
E-mail: *wmunck@davismunck.com*